

## **Remarks**

### **I. Status of claims**

Claims 1-20 were pending.

Claims 21-36 have been added.

Claims 8, 10, 11, and 19 have been rewritten in independent form in response to the Examiner's indication that such claimed would be allowable. These claims now should be in condition for allowance.

### **II. Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 2, 12, and 14 have been amended to address the Examiner's § 112, second paragraph, concerns. The Examiner's rejection of claims 2, 3, 12, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, now should be withdrawn.

### **III. Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

#### **A. Claims 1, 2, 4, 13, and 14**

Claims 1 and 13 are independent claims. Claims 2 and 4 depend from independent claim 1 and claim 14 depends from independent claim 13.

Each of independent claims 1 and 13 has been amended and now recites that content information for at least a front region and spinal region of the cover is received, and that a final content layout for the cover is composed by scaling content received for the front cover region and formatting content received for the spinal region of the cover to accommodate the width and height dimensions of the book spine based upon received document size information and received cover content information.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 13, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Michaelis (U.S. 2002/0057453). Michaelis, however, fails to teach or suggest anything about scaling front cover content and formatting spinal region content to accommodate the width and height dimensions of the book spine based upon document size information and cover

content information received through an interface, as recited in claims 1 and 13. In Michaelis' approach, the page size and the cover size for a book are predetermined for a given book title. Michaelis' system prints an image on the cover of a given book at a position that is shifted laterally by an amount needed to accommodate the slight difference between the measured caliper for the given book and a pre-stored nominal caliper value for the particular book title corresponding to the given book (see, e.g., ¶ [0019]). That is, Michaelis' system laterally shifts cover images slightly to the left or right based solely on the slight difference between the measured caliper for the given book and a pre-stored nominal caliper value for the particular book title. Therefore, Michaelis' system does not scale content received for the front cover region, as now recited in claims 1 and 13.

In addition, Michaelis does not even hint that his system formats content received for the spinal region of the cover to accommodate the width and height dimensions of the book spine. Indeed, Michaelis' system adjusts the cover printing process based solely on the slight difference between the measured caliper for the given book and a pre-stored nominal caliper value for the particular book title. Therefore, Michaelis' system does not even consider the height dimension of the book spine when adjusting the cover printing process.

For at least these reasons, the Examiner's rejection of independent claims 1 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Michaelis now should be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 4 incorporate the features of independent claim 1 and claim 14 incorporates the features of independent claim 13. Therefore, claims 2, 4, and 14 are patentable over Michaelis for at least the same reasons explained above.

#### B. Claim 20

Independent claim 20 has been amended and now recites that content information for at least a front region and spinal region of the cover is received, and that a final content layout for the cover is composed by scaling content received for the front cover region and formatting content received for the spinal region of the cover to accommodate the width and height dimensions of the book spine based upon received document size information and received cover content information.

The Examiner has rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Kosasa (U.S. 5,735,659). In particular, the Examiner has asserted that:

Kosasa et al. discloses in Fig. 1-2A, a bookbinding system comprising a sheet composer configured to format a document to be bound (202); a sheet binder (203) configured to form a text body of two or more sheets having an exposed spine characterized by dimensions; a cover authoring tool comprising an interface (306) configured to receive size information and content information for a cover, a cover content layout engine (317) configured to compose a final content layout for the cover including the spinal content to accommodate the dimensions for the book spine and cover content (col. 9, lines 44-58); and a cover binder (203) configured to attach the cover to the text body.

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, however, Kosasa does not teach or suggest anything about a cover having a front content region and a spinal content region, much less anything about a cover binder configured to attach such a cover to a text body, as recited in claim 20. Instead, Kosasa merely discloses a binding apparatus that is configured to bind a set of sheets with a length of binding tape 77 that is applied to the spine of the sheet set S1, as shown in FIG. 2B (see, e.g., col. 4, line 57, through col. 5, line 5).

In addition, Kosasa fails to teach or suggest anything about receiving content information for a front region of a cover and scaling the received front cover content, as now recited in claim 20. Indeed, since Kosasa's system does not handle covers with front and spinal content regions that are to be attached to text bodies, there is no need whatsoever for Kosasa's system to receive content information for a front region of such a cover or to scale the received front cover content.

For at least the reasons explained above, the Examiner's rejection of independent claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Kosasa now should be withdrawn.

#### IV. Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

##### A. Claim 3

Claim 3 incorporates the features of independent claim 1.

The Examiner has rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Michaelis in view of Carlson (WO 01/00423).

Carlson, however, does not make up for Michaelis' failure to teach or suggest scaling front cover content and formatting spinal region content to accommodate the width and

height dimensions of the book spine based upon document size information and cover content information received through an interface, as recited in claim 1. Indeed, Carlson's system does not receive any cover content whatsoever. Instead, a user must add cover content manually using a separate system (see, e.g., page 17, lines 9-15).

In addition, Carlson does not make up for Michaelis' failure to teach or suggest formatting content received for the spinal region of the cover to accommodate the width and height dimensions of the book spine, as recited in claim 1. Indeed, Carlson's system does not receive any cover content, and Carlson does not even hint that his system could be configured to format content received for the spinal region of the cover to accommodate the width and height dimensions of the book spine.

Therefore, for at least the reasons explained above in connection with independent claim 1, the Examiner's rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Michaelis in view of Carlson now should be withdrawn.

B. Claims 5-7, 15, and 16

Claims 5-7 incorporate the features of independent claim 1 and claims 15 and 16 incorporate the features of independent claim 13.

The Examiner has rejected claims 5-7, 15, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Michaelis in view of Tonkin (U.S. 6,616,702).

Tonkin, however, does not make up for Michaelis' failure to teach or suggest formatting spinal region content to accommodate the width and height dimensions of the book spine based upon document size information and cover content information received through an interface, as recited in claim 1. Indeed, Tonkin's system does not receive any spinal content whatsoever.

In addition, Tonkin does not make up for Michaelis' failure to teach or suggest formatting content received for the spinal region of the cover to accommodate the width and height dimensions of the book spine. Indeed, Tonkin's system does not receive any spinal cover content and, therefore, Tonkin does not even hint that his system could be configured to format content received for the spinal region of the cover to accommodate the width and height dimensions of the book spine.

Therefore, for at least the reasons explained above in connection with independent claims 1 and 13, the Examiner's rejection of claims 5-7, 15, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Michaelis in view of Carlson now should be withdrawn.

C. Claims 9, 11, 12, and 17

Claims 9, 11, and 12 incorporate the features of independent claim 1, and claim 17 incorporates the features of independent claim 13.

The Examiner has rejected claims 9, 11, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Michaelis in view of Kosasa.

Kosasa, however, does not make up for Michaelis' failure to teach or suggest scaling front cover content. Indeed, as explained above in connection with independent claim 20, Kosasa's system does not handle a book cover having a front content region and a spinal content region and, for this reason, Kosasa's system does not receive any content whatsoever for a front region of such a cover.

Therefore, for at least the reasons explained above in connection with independent claims 1 and 13, the Examiner's rejection of claims 9, 11, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Michaelis in view of Kosasa now should be withdrawn.

V. Conclusion

For the reasons explained above, all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance and should be allowed.

Charge any excess fees or apply any credits to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Applicant : Chit Wei Saw et al.  
Serial No. : 09/991,951  
Filed : November 26, 2001  
Page : 14 of 14

Attorney's Docket No.: 10012969-1  
Amendment dated March 18, 2004  
Reply to Office action dated January 9, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 18, 2004



Edouard Garcia  
Reg. No. 38,461  
Telephone No.: (650) 631-6591

Please direct all correspondence to:

Hewlett-Packard Company  
Intellectual Property Administration  
Legal Department, M/S 35  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80528-9599